

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
FORT WORTH DIVISION**

<b>SHAUNTRELLA TRENESSE LONDON,</b>	§	
	§	
<b>Plaintiff,</b>	§	
	§	
<b>v.</b>	§	<b>Civil Action No. 4:22-cv-00247-O-BP</b>
	§	
<b>COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL</b>	§	
<b>SECURITY,</b>	§	
	§	
<b>Defendant.</b>	§	

**FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATION  
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

Plaintiff Shauntrella Trenesse London filed a civil case along with a motion for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*. ECF Nos. 1, 2. The undersigned was preliminarily assigned pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Special Order No. 3. *See* ECF No. 5. The findings, conclusions, and recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge are as follows:

**FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS**

**A. NATURE OF THE CASE**

This case is a new civil action.

**B. PARTIES**

Shauntrella Trenesse London is the plaintiff. She has named as defendant the Commissioner of Social Security.

**C. LEGAL ANALYSIS**

Plaintiff accompanied her complaint with a completed long-form motion/application to proceed in forma pauperis under 28 U.S.C. § 1915 *et. seq.* ECF No. 2. The fully completed motion/application includes the income and asset information for Plaintiff. *Id.* In making the in-

forma-pauperis determination, the Court must consider the total monetary resources available to Plaintiff and ask whether payment of fees would result in Plaintiff “suffering undue financial hardship.” *Prows v. Kastner*, 842 F.2d 138, 140 (5th Cir. 1988). By Order dated April 5, 2022, the undersigned determined Plaintiff has sufficient financial resources to pay the filing fee in this matter without suffering undue financial hardship and directed her to do so on or before April 19, 2022. ECF No. 6 at 2. That Order warned Plaintiff that “denial of leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* will be recommended” if she failed to comply. *Id.*

To date, Plaintiff has not complied with the Court’s prior order by paying the applicable filing fee. Because the information in Plaintiff’s motion/application shows she has sufficient resources to pay the applicable filing and administrative fees and she did not do so by the deadline in the Court’s April 5 Order, the undersigned finds that the motion to proceed IFP should be denied.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

It is, therefore, **RECOMMENDED** that United States District Judge Reed O’Connor **DENY** Plaintiff’s motion to proceed *in forma pauperis*.

It is further **RECOMMENDED** that Judge O’Connor inform Plaintiff that her complaint will be subject to dismissal without further notice under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b) unless Plaintiff pays to the clerk of Court the applicable filing and administrative fees of \$402.00 within seven (7) days after his order.

A copy of these findings, conclusions, and recommendation shall be served on all parties in the manner provided by law. Any party who objects to any part of these findings, conclusions, and recommendation must file specific written objections within fourteen days after being served with a copy. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2). To be specific, an objection must

identify the particular finding or recommendation to which objection is made, state the basis for the objection, and specify the place in the magistrate judge's findings, conclusions, and recommendation where the disputed determination is found. An objection that merely incorporates by reference or refers to the briefing before the magistrate judge is not specific. Failure to file specific written objections will bar the aggrieved party from appealing the factual findings and legal conclusions of the magistrate judge that are accepted or adopted by the district court, except upon grounds of plain error. *See Douglass v. United Servs. Auto. Ass'n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1417 (5th Cir. 1996) (en banc).

It is further **ORDERED** that the above-styled and numbered action, previously referred to the undersigned for findings, conclusions, and recommendation, be and is hereby, **RETURNED** to the docket of the United States District Judge.

**SIGNED** on April 25, 2022.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Hal R. Ray, Jr.  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE